

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the search and analysis reflected in the Action dated August 20, 2009. Having studied the Action and considered the analysis therein, Applicants provide the included amendments and the following remarks, and request favorable reconsideration of the pending claims on that basis.

The Abstract was objected to as containing an excessive number of words. Appropriate correction has been made herein by way of an amendment to the Abstract, and it is respectfully submitted that the amended Abstract is not objectionable.

Claims 10 and 20 were objected to based on formal issues.¹ The noted issues have been addressed herein by way of amendments to claims 10 and 20. It is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 20 are now no longer objectionable.

Regarding the objection to claims 19-20 under section 101, the affected claims have been amended herein to refer more specifically to a computer-readable medium as suggested in the Action. It is thus respectfully submitted that these claims as presently formatted are no longer objectionable under section 101.

Turning to the art-based rejections, all claims were rejected based on Yokomizo, either under section 102 or section 103. With respect to claim 6, this claim was also rejected based on Official Notice. Applicants understand the various rejections, and based on the amendments herein, would respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In particular, the claims as currently amended have been clarified to show that they relate to the protection and exploitation of copyrighted materials and provide specific steps and mechanisms to this end. Claim 1 is exemplary, and is reproduced below for ease of reference:

1. A method of editing and printing a photo album, the method comprising:
storing low quality and high quality digital representations of photographs in a server system, wherein the server system is divided to provide open access to a portion of its contents and to provide user-specific access to another portion of its contents;

¹ The Action refers to claims 10, 22, 24, and 25, but it appears this may be a typo.

sending the low quality digital representations to a client computer remote from the server system in association with respective identifiers of the photographs; editing an electronic representation of pages of the photo album at the client computer, using an interactive display with the low quality digital representations of interactively selected photographs; sending an editing result of said editing from the client computer to the server system, including identifiers of the selected photographs; retrieving, in the server system, the stored high quality digital representation of the selected photographs identified by the identifiers in the editing result; printing the pages of the photo album in the server system using the retrieved high quality digital representations in response to a printing command; and updating an account record in a memory of the server according to copyright royalty information associated with the identifiers in response to the printing command.

As can be seen, this claim encompasses a system that not only controls copyrighted works by selectively providing high-resolution and low-resolution versions of images, but also provides an accounting functionality that is related to the copyright status of the material. In particular, claim 1 recites “updating an account record in a memory of the server according to copyright royalty information associated with the identifiers in response to the printing command.”

In addition, the invention of claim 1 provides a specific server structure that allows for access control in a bifurcated or two-tiered fashion that further controls the dissemination of copyrighted materials. For example, amended claim 1 requires that the server system is divided to provide “open access to a portion of its contents and to provide user-specific access to another portion of its contents.”

It will be appreciated that the prior art of record does not show the control of copyrighted material, especially in the recited manner using specific accounting techniques tied to image identifier information. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is patentable over the art of record, and allowance is now respectfully requested.

Moreover, some or all of the distinctions listed above also apply to independent claims 8, 10, 11, 15, 19, and 20 as well, by virtue of incorporation of parent limitations, to all pending independent claims. Therefore favorable reconsideration and allowance of these claims is also requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip Pippenger, Reg. No. 46055
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: January 20, 2009
2010